UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,123	01/12/2004	Ralf Gutsche	HSJ920030256US1	3143

7590 08/09/2006

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/756,123	GUTSCHE, RALF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/12/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

Drawings

2. The Drawings filed on 1/12/2004 are acceptable for examination purpose.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on 1/12/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(II)A:

Identify and understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting

point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some indication of the practical application for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the practical application requirement. See Arrhythmia, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material ***stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting****. For example, a claim directed to a word processing* ***file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility*** *requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 since the information stored may have some* ***"real world"*** *value. However, the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101* ***does not mean that a useful result is achieved under the practical application requirement. The claimed invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application****.*

4. Regarding claim 1, "*A graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines, the GUI displayable on a user computer monitor and comprising:at least one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define a type of pipe input set data; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of*

the class, the instance producing the GUI page" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 1 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure particularly pages 1-26 as software code, such that the graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and ***claim 1*** do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 1 elements particularly "at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI page" is not producing "useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 1 is a non-statutory subject matter, is merely software code or algorithm, is not producing "useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 1 is a non-statutory subject matter[see Interim Guidelines page 55-57].

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention must produce a ***"useful, concrete and tangible result."*** The **Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility** states in section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):

> The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ

at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application.").

Claim 1 have the result of producing results related to "at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI page" however the claim limitation[s] does not output useful, concrete and tangible result.

The claims 1-9 dependent from claim 1 is also rejected in the above analysis.

5. Regarding claim 10, "A graphical user interface (GUI) for a pipeline architecture. comprising: means for generating and modifying pipelines without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial core code" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 1 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure particularly pages 1-26 as software code, such that the graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and ***claim 10*** do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 10 elements is not producing "useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 10 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention must produce a ***"useful, concrete and tangible result."*** The **Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility** states in section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):

The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application.").

The claims 11-18 dependent from claim 10 is also rejected in the above analysis.

6. Regarding claim 19, " A method for generating a pipeline for processing data from at least one data store, comprising: presenting a main GUI window; using the main GUI window to access an initial core code; using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI window; and using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least in part" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 19 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure particularly pages 1-26 as software code, such that the generating a pipeline for processing data is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and ***claim 19*** do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 19 elements particularly "; using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI window; and using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least in part" is not producing "useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 19 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The claims 20-25 dependent from claim 19 is also rejected in the above analysis.

It is further noted that there is no full description or details regarding hardware or physical media, but merely suggests fig 1 suggests data store contains raw data records and pipeline communicates with the processing modules...[spec page 6]

For "General Analysis for Determining Patent-Eligible Subject Matter", see 101 Interim Guidelines as indicated below:

<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>>

No new matter should be entered

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1-25 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23of US Application No.10/755,699; Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because co-pending application 10/755,699, claims contains every element of claims 10/756,123 of the instant application and thus anticipate the claims of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed.Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of

obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). "ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. ***Claims 1-9,21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over* Drawschwandtner *et al. [hereafter* Drawschwandtner*], US Publication No. 20030210275 published on Nov. 13,2003 in view of Broussard et al. [hereafter Broussard], US Pub. No. 2003/0159130***

10. As to claim 1, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'A graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines' [see Abstract, fig 2, page 1, 0011], graphical user interface corresponds to Drawschwandtner's fig 2; pipelines corresponds to software modules generated for specific applications using software tools as detailed in page 1, col 2, 0011; the GUI displayable on a user computer monitor' [fig 2] and comprising: at least one pipe input set window configured to permit-a user to define a type of pipe input set data' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5, page 2, col 2, 0020], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches menu GUI menu allows command line options that allows users to define input as detailed in page 2, col 2, 0020 ; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class [page 6, col 1, line 1-3], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches GUI module configured to generate user's selection of commands and using

'the instance producing the GUI page' [page 3, col 1, 0025]. It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically teaches 'Java reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++ language structure [page 2, col 1, 0018] . On the other hand, Broussard disclosed Java reflection' [see Abstract, page 1, col 1, 0007], Broussard specifically teaches Java reflection API calls in software development.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner because both Drawschwandtner and Broussard are specifically directed to software development particularly generating software modules [see Broussard: page 3, col 2, 0040-0041; Drawschwandtner: page 1, col 2, 0010], and both Broussard, Drawschwandtner specifically teaches "user interface or GUI used for various commands [see Broussard: fig 1, Drawschwandtner" fig 2, Abstract], and both Broussard, Drawschwandtner suggests C++ software modules [see Broussard: page 4, col 2, 0052, line 6-11; Drawschwandtner: page 2, col 1, 0018, line 2-7] and both specifically teach creating software modules using user interface.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner because that would have allowed users of Drawschwandtner to implement Java objects, particularly Java

reflection API using software development wizard, further as the flexibility to manipulate Java classes, i.e., manipulating properties for example Java class to obtain the names of all its members and display them while it is not possible in typical C or C++, therefore, improving software applications useful in programming environment [page 1, 0015-0016].

11. As to claim 2, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least the pipe input set window and GUI page require no programming apart from an initial core code' [page 3, col 1, 0023].

12. As to claim 3, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI is an incremental GUI wherein GUI pages for new pipe components can be added incrementally without changing existing code' [page 4, col 2, 0037].

13. As to claim 4, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least one new pipe module is based on a pre-existing module type' [page 4, col 2, 0035].

14. As to claim 5, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least one new pipe module is based on a new user-defined component type' [page 5, col 1, 0039, line 13-20].

15. As to claim 6, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI defines a set of interfaces, each interface including plural functions' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5], the GUI including a GUI representation part and a storage part, the GUI representation part defining how something is displayed and the storage part defining how GUI parameters are stored in an external storage' [page 2, col 2, 0020].

16. As to claim 7, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Output Set tab for defining PipeOutputSet representative of a type of output data from the pipeline' [page 4, col 1, 0031].

17. As to claim 8, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Storage For TupleSets tab for defining an arbitrary number of elements contained in a StorageForTupleSets component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being definable for each element in the component' [page 3, 0025, page 4, 0036, fig 2].

18. As to claim 9, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Modules tab for defining an arbitrary number of PipeModules of the pipeline, a type being selected for each PipeModule using the tab, the type defining at least in part the GUI' [page 4, 0035].

19. As to claim 21, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'generating the GUI page by translating the type using a configuration file to a class' [page 1, col 2, 0010];

'using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, 'the instance producing the GUI page' [fig 2]. On the other hand, It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically teaches 'Java reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++ language structure [page 2, col 1, 0018] . On the other hand, Broussard disclosed Java reflection' [see Abstract, page 1, col 1, 0007], Broussard specifically teaches Java reflection API calls in software development.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner because both Drawschwandtner and Broussard are specifically directed to software development particularly generating software modules [see Broussard: page 3, col 2, 0040-0041; Drawschwandtner: page 1, col 2, 0010], and both Broussard, Drawschwandtner specifically teaches "user interface or GUI used for various commands [see Broussard: fig 1, Drawschwandtner" fig 2, Abstract], and both Broussard, Drawschwandtner suggests C++ software modules [see Broussard: page 4, col 2, 0052, line 6-11; Drawschwandtner: page 2, col 1, 0018, line 2-7] and both specifically teach creating software modules using user interface.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner because that would have allowed users of Drawschwandtner to implement Java objects, particularly Java

reflection API using software development wizard, further as the flexibility to manipulate Java classes, i.e., manipulating properties for example Java class to obtain the names of all its members and display them while it is not possible in typical C or C++, therefore, improving software applications useful in programming environment.[page 1, 0015-0016].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

20. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

21. Claims 10-20, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated, by* Drawschwandtner et al. [hereafter Drawschwandtner], *US Pub No. 2003/0210275 published on Nov 13, 2003.

22. As to claim 10, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'means for generating and modifying Pipelines without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial core code' [Abstract, page 4, col 1, 0032, fig 2], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches software tool particularly commands and options are selected from the graphical user interface menu as detailed in fig 2, further it is noted that software modules are developed using C++, or C compiler languages [page 2, 0018, col 2, line 2-6], pipelines corresponds to software modules as detailed in Abstract.

23. As to claim 11, Drawschwandtner disclosed at least one pipe input set window configured to permit-a user to define a type of pipe input set data' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5, page 2, col 2, 0020], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches menu GUI menu allows command line options that allows users to define input as detailed in page 2, col 2, 0020 ; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class [page 6, col 1, line 1-3], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches GUI module configured to generate user's selection of commands and using 'the instance producing the GUI page' [page 3, col 1, 0025]. It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does ot specifically teaches 'Java reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++ language structure [page 2, col 1, 0018]

24. As to claim 12, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least the pipe input set window and GUI page require no programming apart from an initial core code' [page 3, col 1, 0023].

25. As to claim 13, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI is an incremental GUI wherein GUI pages for new pipe components can be added incrementally without changing existing code' [page 4, col 2, 0037].

26. As to claim 14, 22, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI defines a set of interfaces, each interface including plural functions' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5], the GUI including a GUI representation part and a storage part, the GUI representation part defining how something is displayed and the storage part defining how GUI parameters are stored in an external storage' [page 2, col 2, 0020].

27. As to claim 15, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Output Set tab for defining PipeOutputSet representative of a type of output data from the pipeline' [page 4, col 1, 0031].

28. As to claim 16, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Storage For TupleSets tab for defining an arbitrary number of elements contained in a StorageForTupleSets component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being definable for each element in the component' [page 3, 0025, page 4, 0036, fig 2].

29. As to claim 17, 9, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Modules tab for defining an arbitrary number of PipeModules of the pipeline, a type being selected for each PipeModule using the tab, the type defining at least in part the GUI' [page 4, 0035].

30. As to claim 18, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'means for making available new pipeline module types without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial core code' [page 5, col 1, 0038, line 1-8, 0039].

31. As to claim 19, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'presenting a main GUI window' [fig 2, page 4, 0038, line 1-2], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches user interface or GUI as detailed in fig 2;

'using the main GUI window to access an initial core code' page 4, col 2, 0037, fig 2];

'using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI window' [page 5, col 1, 0041];

using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least in part' [page 5, col 2, 0042].

32. As to claim 20, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the main GUI window is at least one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define a type of pipe input set data, at least one GUI page based on the type being configurable' [page 3, 0023].

33. As to claim 23, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'defining a representative of a type of output data from the pipeline' [page 3, 0023].

34. As to claim 24, Drawschwandtner defining an arbitrary number of elements contained in a component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being definable for each element in the component' [page 3, 0023-0024].

35. Claim 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated, by Parkhurst, US Patent No. 6668284

36. As to claim 10, Parkhurst teaches a system which including A graphical user interface (GUI) for a Pipeline architecture' [[Abstract, fig 6], graphical user interface corresponds to Parkhurst's fig 6because graphical user interface typically have more than one user interface functions such as "file, edit, ...help" as detailed in fig 6;, pipeline architecture corresponds to Parkhurst's software architecture that including software modules as detailed in Abstract;

' means for generating and modifying Pipelines without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial core code' [col 8, line 66-67, col 9, line 1-17], Parkhurst specifically suggests using C++ defining all objects and generating and modifying messages as detailed in col 9, line 1-17].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Publication. No.	2003/0210275
b.	US Patent No.	6668284.
c.	US Publication. No	20030159130

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
July 24, 2006.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER